



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AT
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| 10/080,437 | 02/21/2002 | Francis James Canova JR. | 25216-0906 | 9150 |
| 7590 | 01/14/2005 | | | |
| SHEMWELL GREGORY & COURTNEY LLP 4880 STEVENS CREEK BLVD. SUITE 201 SAN JOSE, CA 95129 | | | | EXAMINER DATSKOVSKIY, MICHAEL V |
| | | | | ART UNIT 2835 PAPER NUMBER |

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/080,437 | CANOVA ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Michael V Datskovskiy | 2835 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 and 41-60 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 41-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/16/2004.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. The current application claims Priority Date 02/04/1999 of the parent application 09/244,440, which is earlier than 11/29/1999. The reference by Tal et al was filed on 10/30/1998, which is earlier than 11/29/1999, and also at the time invention was made was owned by the different assignee: "3 Com Corporation", which was only later bought by the PALM Corporation. Therefore, the previous rejection (See office Action on 04/14/2004) under 35 USC § 102(e) without claiming benefits of having common assignee or inventor(s) is still applicable and will stay. It will stay also because from examiner's point of view Tal et al, although being a design patent, clearly teaches all claimed in claims 1-5, 41, 43-47, 49, 55-57 and 59-60 limitations including the midframe on which the slot is formed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5, 41, 43-47, 49, 55-57 and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tal et al.

Tal et al teach a hand held computer, Figs. 1-7, comprising: a housing having a midframe formed from a plurality of segments, the midframe forming part of an exterior

of the housing and being at least partially exposed along one or more peripheral surfaces of the housing, the midframe having a first and a second accessory slots associated with a left and right sides of the midframe, respectively, the first and second accessory slots being substantially cylindrical, elongate and capable of receiving and accommodating a removable accessory device – stylus; a front shell coupled to a front side of the midframe; and a back shell coupled to a back side of the midframe, wherein the peripheral portion is formed from at least portions of the front shell and the back shell. Tal et al teach furthermore: said first and second accessory slots partially enclose the accessory device along a length of the accessory device, and a portion of the accessory device is exposed to an exterior of the hand held computer along substantially the length of the accessory device; a bottom of the housing is flared out and acts as a stop for accessory devices inserted into the accessory slots.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6, 42 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tal et al in view of Kim et al.

Tal et al teaches all the limitations of the claims except the idea of using a second accessory slot to retain a spine of a protective case. Kim et al teach a detachable PDA protective case 100, Figs. 1-12, comprising a front and back covers 102, 104,

Art Unit: 2835

connected by a hinge 106 and including a retaining spine 105 intended to be inserted in the one of two accessory slots of a PDA. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time invention was made to employ a second accessory slot in the device by Tal et al to retain a spine of a protective case as it is suggested by Kim et al, in order to diversify utility of accessory slots.

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tal et al in view of Ozawa.

Tal et al teach all the limitations of the claims except said hand held computer further comprises an external port in communication with the first accessory slot, said external port having at least one external port contact, and the stylus has a plurality of contacts, which connect to the external port contacts when the stylus device is inserted into the first accessory slot. Ozawa teaches a hand held computer 1, Fig. 11, comprising: a housing; an accessory slot 3, the slot being substantially cylindrical, elongate and capable of receiving and accommodating a removable accessory device – stylus 4, wherein said hand held computer further comprises an external port in communication with the accessory slot, said external port having a plurality of external port contacts 68, and the stylus has a plurality of contacts 42, which connect to the external port contacts 68 when the stylus device 4 is inserted into the accessory slot 5. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time invention was made to employ in the device by Tal et al a held computer comprising an external port in communication with an accessory slot, said external port having at least one external port contact, and a stylus having a plurality of contacts, which connect to the external port contacts when

the stylus device is inserted into the accessory slot, as it is shown by Ozawa, in order to create an electrical contact between said computer and said stylus.

7. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tal et al in view of Moller et al.

Tal et al teach all the limitations of the claims except said hand held computer accessory slots further each comprise a retaining device for retaining accessory devices. Moller et al teach a hand held computer comprising an accessory slot 26 having a retaining device 28 for retaining accessory device – stylus 12. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time invention was made to employ in the device by Tal et al a held computer comprising an accessory slots having each a retaining device for retaining accessory devices, as it is shown by Moller et al, in order to prevent said accessory devices for being lost. Regarding to the claim 10: Kim et al and Moller et al disclose the claimed invention except for that the notch 21 is located on the stylus and the detent 28 is located in the slot. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate a notch in a slot and a detent on a stylus, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167.

8. Claims 50-54 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tal et al in view of Saliba.

Tal et al teach all the limitations of the claims except at least a third (front) portion of the peripheral surface is formed from a material partially transmissive to infrared light,

Art Unit: 2835

wherein said third peripheral portion is adjacent to a component producing said infrared light. Saliba teaches a PDA 50, Fig.1, comprising a component 53 producing infrared light, wherein said component is adjacent to the front peripheral portion of the PDA housing. Regarding to the material requirements claimed in claims 50, 53 and 58: It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a part (window) covering said infrared light trasmissive to said light (polished if necessary), because it is inherent to use for an infrared communication window to be covered by a material partially transmissive to infrared light, and also since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V Datskovskiy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2040. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on (571) 272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


01/11/05

Michael V Datskovskiy
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2835